

## REMARKS

The Office Action of May 19, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully considered. An RCE is being filed to nullify the “finality” of the Office Action.

The present Amendment revises the specification by introducing terminology (“entities”) that is now used in the claims. The Amendment also revises independent claim 1 to further distinguish the invention from the Wobber et al reference (as will be discussed in more detail below). In addition, the present Amendment revises the dependent claims where appropriate to correct inadvertent informalities or to conform them to the current formulation of claim 1. In addition, the present Amendment adds new claims 13-17 to further protect the invention.

The present application discloses a multi-step technique for identifying an object that is requested by a principal. Applicant’s technique was briefly summarized on pages 6 and 7 of the last Amendment, and rather than repeating that summary, it will simply be incorporated herein by reference. An advantage of Applicant’s multi-step technique is that a storage section for information about principals can be modified without also modifying any storage section for information about objects, and vice versa.

The Office Action rejects the claims for indefiniteness due to the phrase (in claim 1) “in response to principal ID information supplied of said principals.” The present Amendment revises this phrase; claim 1 now refers to “a principal ID supplied by one of said principals.” Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects independent claim 1 (together with a number of dependent claims) for anticipation by U.S. patent 5,235,642 to Wobber et al (which will

hereafter be called “Wobber”). For the reasons discussed below, however, it is respectfully submitted that the current formulation of claim 1 adequately distinguishes the present invention from the Wobber reference.

Claim 1 now recites that a “a principal information storing section” stores “a principal ID” for each principal and “a principal information value that contains information about the respective principal.” An “object information storing section” stores “an object information value” for each object and “a principal information value template … indicating at least one condition that must be fulfilled as a precondition for receiving the respective object.” In addition, claim 1 now recites “an application section to retrieve a principal information value … in response to a principal ID supplied by one of said principles, to use a matching rule to transform the retrieved principal information value into a transformed value, and to ascertain whether the transformed value is the same as one of the principal information value templates …”. If so, claim 1 provides that “said one of said principals is determined to fulfill a condition for being an authorized recipient of the object corresponding to said one of the principal information value templates.”


It is respectfully submitted that Wobber neither discloses nor suggests using a principal ID to retrieve a principal information value and then transforming this principal information value using a matching rule, in order to be able to ascertain whether the transformed value is the same as a stored code (called a “principal information value template” in claim 1) corresponding to an object. The Office Action refers to a passage in column 4 of Wobber. This passage explains that access to Wobber’s objects is governed by a reference monitor program and each object is controlled by an Access

Control List that specifies principals that are authorized to access the object. Since Wobber's objects include a list of authorized principals, adding or dropping a principal would mean that the objects associated with this principal would also need to be changed. This is unnecessary in the multi-step technique that is now recited in claim 1 for associating a principal with an object that the principal is authorized to receive.

Since the remaining claims depend from claim 1 and recite additional limitations to further define the invention, they are patentable along with claim 1 and need not be further discussed.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Allen Wood  
Registration No. 28,134  
Customer No. 23995  
(202) 326-0222  
(202) 408-0924 (facsimile)  
(202) 408-5297 (facsimile)

AW:rw